



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,451	09/28/2001	Joshua W. Kite	BS01-167	1698

45695 7590 01/10/2007  
WITHERS & KEYS FOR BELL SOUTH  
P. O. BOX 71355  
MARIETTA, GA 30007-1355

EXAMINER
----------

BATURAY, ALICIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/10/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/964,451

Applicant(s)

KITE ET AL.

Examiner

Alicia Baturay

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 April 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in response to the amendment filed 30 October 2006.
2. Claims 1, 10, 17 and 24 were amended.
3. Claims 1-29 are pending in this Office Action.

### ***Response to Amendment***

4. A telephone call was made to Alton Hornsby (Reg. #47,299) on 4 January 2006 to discuss conditions for allowance, but a return phone call was not received at the time of the mailing of this Office Action.
5. Applicant's amendments and arguments with respect to claims 24-29 filed on 30 October 2006 have been fully considered but they are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

### ***Claim Objections***

6. Claims 1, 10 and 17 are objected to because of the following informalities: Applicant states "...accessing the information from the relational database based on the wire centers selected to thereby display for each selected location of the wire center *that is selected* the individual pieces of equipment..." In the interest of clarity, it is suggested that this limitation may be amended to read "...accessing the information from the relational database based on the wire centers selected to thereby display for each selected location of the wire center the individual pieces of equipment..." Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanschagrín et al. (U.S. 6,295,540) in view of Grau et al. (U.S. 5,910,03) in view of Austin et al. (U.S. 5,500,934) in view of Farris et al. (U.S. 5,881,131) in view of Germain et al. (U.S. 6,900,822) and in further view of Crawford ("Windows 2000 Pro: The Missing Manual).

9. With respect to claim 24, Sanschagrín teaches a computer system operable to present a graphical user interface for displaying information representative of telephone network facilities, the graphical user interface obtaining data for display from a plurality of first tables populated with information gathered from a plurality of second tables that are populated with data stored in a telephone network facilities system, the computer system comprising:

A client machine (Sanschagrín, Fig. 3, element 17; col. 6, lines 21-24); and server database in communication with client machine (Sanschagrín, Fig. 3, element 11; col. 6, lines 18-20).

Sanschagrín does not explicitly teach different sections displaying differing information within a graphical user interface.

However, Grau teaches the computer system where the graphical user interface comprises: a first section for listing a plurality of wire centers (Grau, Fig. 6, element 610; col. 7, lines 49-60); a second section for listing a plurality of equipment located within the wire centers (Grau, Fig. 6, element 620; col. 7, line 66 – col. 8, line 10); a third section for listing location information associated with a piece of equipment selected in the second section (Grau, col. 12, lines 50-56) and the graphical user interface providing a prompt for a district where multiple wire centers exist for each district, and in response to receiving a district, listing the available wire centers for the district (Grau, Fig. 6, element 620; col. 7, line 66 – col. 8, line 10), and upon receiving a selection of the available wire centers, accessing the information from the relational database based on the wire centers selected to thereby display for each selected location of the wire center that is selected the individual pieces of equipment (Grau, Fig. 6, element 620; col. 7, line 66 – col. 8, line 10 and col. 4, lines 7-12), and the T1 circuits available (Grau, col. 9, line 62 – col. 10, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Sanschagrín in view of Grau in order to provide different sections displaying differing information within a graphical user interface. One would be motivated to do so in order to facilitate viewing different parts and elements within the network.

The combination of Sanschagrín and Grau does not explicitly teach does not explicitly teach supplying a picture of the piece of equipment being monitored.

However, Austin teaches a fourth section for displaying a picture of the equipment selected in second section (Austin, Fig. 5; col. 11, lines 33-41) and the T1 circuits working, the total T1 circuits (Austin, col. 8, lines 13-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Sanschagrín and Grau in view of Austin in order to enable the display of a picture of the piece of equipment. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for providing a visual context for the administrator.

The combination of Sanschagrín, Grau and Austin does not explicitly teach ADSL availability displayed.

However, Farris teaches where information representative of ADSL availability, the ADSL circuits working, and the total ADSL circuits (Farris, col. 48, lines 55-61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify combination of Sanschagrín, Grau and Austin in view of Farris in order to enable the display of availability of ADSL lines. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for the display of degrees of availability of ADSL lines.

The combination of Sanschagrín, Grau, Austin and Farris does not explicitly teach the use of color to indicate a minimum and maximum range of capacities of the circuits.

However, Germain teaches where the selected location is displayed against a colored background, the color corresponding to a range comprising a minimum percentage and a maximum percentage of T1 circuits in use at the location (Germain, col. 5, line 8 – col. 6, line 27 and the table).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Sanschagrín, Grau, Austin and Farris in view of Germain in order to enable the use of color to indicate the capacity of the circuits. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide a method for visually representing performance and flow analysis of a communication network having devices connected by links. The method selectively maps the data on the graphical representation of the communication network by varying visual characteristics of the devices and the links for viewing on the display.

The combination of Sanschagrín, Grau, Austin, Farris and Germain does not explicitly teach the cascading of windows.

However, Crawford teaches the information of each location being displayed in a separate window, and with the windows of the locations being cascaded (Crawford, "4.1.3. Manipulating Windows with the Taskbar," Fig. 4-4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Sanschagrín, Grau, Austin, Farris and Germain in view of Crawford in order to enable cascading of windows. One would have been motivated to do so in order to maintain consistency in expected behaviors when working with multiple windows.

10. With respect to claim 25, Sanschagrín teaches the invention described in claim 24, including the computer system where the telephone network facilities system comprises LEIS (Sanschagrín, col. 4, lines 40-43).

Art Unit: 2155

11. With respect to claim 26, Sanschagrín teaches the invention described in claim 24, including the computer system further comprising means for extracting the data from the telephone network facilities system (Sanschagrín, col. 6, lines 16-17).

12. With respect to claim 27, the combination of Sanschagrín and Grau teaches the invention described in claim 24, including a first section for listing a plurality of wire centers (Grau, Fig. 6, element 610; col. 7, lines 49-60).

The combination of Sanschagrín and Grau does not explicitly teach the use of color to indicate capacity of communication lines.

However, Austin teaches the computer system where a color code is applied to each of the listed wire centers to indicate a capacity level (Austin, col. 8, lines 53-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Sanschagrín and Grau in view of Austin in order to enable the use of color to indicate capacity of communication lines. One would be motivated to do so in order to facilitate efficiency in viewing segments of the network.

13. With respect to claim 28, the combination of Sanschagrín and Grau teaches the invention described in claim 24, including the method further comprising simultaneously displaying available ADSL lines (Farris, col. 48, lines 55-61).

The combination of Sanschagrín and Grau does not explicitly teach displaying working and total ADSL lines.



However, Austin teaches where the third section lists at least one of ADSL capacity, ADSL working and ADSL availability values (Austin, col. 8, lines 13-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Sanschagrín and Grau in view of Austin order to enable the display of working and total ADSL lines per wire center. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for further efficiency in viewing connection of the network per area.

14. With respect to claim 29, the combination of Sanschagrín and Grau teaches the invention described in claim 24, including the method further comprising simultaneously displaying T1s available (Grau, col. 9, line 62 – col. 10, line 7).

The combination of Sanschagrín and Grau does not explicitly teach displaying T1s working and all T1s for a wire center.

However, Austin teaches where the third section lists at least one of working T1s, available T1s and total T1s (Austin, col. 8, lines 13-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Sanschagrín and Grau in view of Austin in order to enable the display of T1s working and total T1s per wire center. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for further efficiency in viewing connection of the network per area.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

15. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: Claims 1-23 are allowable over the prior art of record.

The examiner has found that the prior art of record does not teach, suggest, or render obvious the specific combination of a method of managing telephone network facilities comprising a matrix of feeder-distribution interface data in the telephone network, the matrix including a plurality of service type fields for identifying different telecommunications services provided in the telephone network, a plurality of facility type fields for identifying facilities having different transmission characteristics, and a spare field for identifying a number of spare circuits for each of a plurality of facility types, wherein the matrix displays a number of circuits of a plurality of service types which are being served from each of the plurality of facility types and a number of the different telecommunication services which are capable of being provisioned for each of the plurality of service types based on the number of spare circuits (major difference in the claims not found in the prior art) as set forth in the specification and recited in independent claims 1, 10 and 17.

***Response to Arguments***

16. Applicant's arguments filed 30 October 2006 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive for the reasons set forth below.

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2155

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Baturay whose telephone number is (571) 272-3981. The examiner can normally be reached at M-Th 7:15 - 5pm, 2nd Fridays 7:15-3:45, and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alicia Baturay  
January 5, 2007

*Bharat Barot*  
BHARAT BAROT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER